



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० २४] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जून १७, १९६७/ ज्यैष्ठ २७, १८८९
No. 24] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1967/JYAISTHA 27, 1889

अस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके ।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

नोटिस

NOTICE

नीचे लिखे भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र ३१ मई १९६७ तक प्रकाशित किये गये :—

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published up to the 31st May, 1967:—

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
303	S.O. 1869, dated 29th May, 1967.	Election Commission, India.	Deletion of certain entries in the notifications mentioned therein.
304	S.O. 1949, dated 30th May, 1967.	Central Board of Direct Taxes.	The Income-tax (Third Amendment) Rules, 1967.
305	S.O. 1949, dated 31st May, 1967.	Ministry of Steel, Mines & Metals.	Acquiring the lands specified in the Schedules therein.
306	S.O. 1951, dated 31st May, 1967.	Central Board of Direct Taxes.	Corrigendum to S.O. 598, dated 13th February, 1967.

ऊपर लिखे असाधारण राजपत्रों की प्रतियां प्रकाशन प्रबन्धक, सिविल लाइन्स, दिल्ली के नाम मांगपत्र भेजने पर भेज दी जाएंगी। मांगपत्र प्रबन्धक के पास इन राजपत्रों के जारी होने की तारीख से १० दिन के भीतर पहुंच जाने चाहिए।

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किए गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 16th May 1967

S.O. 2016.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section 4 of section 86 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, (5 of 1908) the Central Government hereby specifies that the provisions of sub-sections (1) to (3) of section 86 of the Code shall apply to such members of the staff or retinue of the Ruler, Ambassador or Envoy of a foreign State or of the High Commissioner of a Commonwealth country as may be included in the Diplomatic List published by the Ministry of External Affairs from time to time, as they apply in relation to the Ruler of a foreign State.

[No. D.II 451/65(18/14)]

S. BIKRAM SIAH Jt. Secy.

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 मई 1967

एस० ओ० 2017—सिविल प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1908 (1908 का 5) के खण्ड 86 के उपखण्ड 4 की धारा (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त प्राधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्र सरकार इस के द्वारा निर्देशित करती है कि इस संहिता के खण्ड 86 के (1) से (3) तक के उपखण्डों की व्यवस्थाएं श्रमकों के ऐसे सदस्यों अथवा शासक के अनुचरों पर, किसी विदेशी राज्य के राजदूत अथवा दूत पर या किसी राष्ट्रमंडलीय देश के हाई कमिशनर पर लागू होंगी जिनके नाम विदेश मंत्रालय द्वारा समय-समय पर प्रकाशित की जाने वाली राजनयिक सूची में शामिल किए जाएं, जैसी कि वे किसी विदेशी राज्य के शासक के सम्बन्ध में लागू होती है।

शार्दूल बिक्रम शाह, सह सचिव ।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 8th June, 1967

S.O. 2018.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 12 read with clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India

Act, 1934 (2 of 1934) the Central Government hereby nominates Raja Ramdave Row of 'Shivananda Griha', 77, Begumpet, Hyderabad, as a Director of the Central Board of the Reserve Bank of India, *vice* Shri M. Sudarsanam.

[No. F. 3(77)-BC/66.]

S.O. 2019.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India as on the 2nd June, 1967.

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	34,34,20,000
		Rupee Coin	3,86,000
Reserve Fund	80,00,00,000	Small Coins	4,11,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	115,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(a) Internal	—
		(b) External	—
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	233,62,32,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	16,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	27,30,73,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	20,00,00,000	Investments**	311,15,12,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government	—
		(ii) State Governments @	17,28,00,000

Deposits :—		Loans and advances to :—	
(a) Government		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	
			19,49,69,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	1,33,60,09,000
		(iii) Others	1,81,15,000
(i) Central Government	53,49,57,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund:—	
(ii) State Governments	22,61,41,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments	28,33,71,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	11,15,76,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	—
(b) Banks		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	7,09,26,000
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	120,38,87,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund:—	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	5,76,34,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	60,07,000		2,76,42,000
(iv) Other Banks	5,45,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund:—	
(c) Others	264,34,57,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	5,24,15,000
Bills Payable	36,45,19,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	—
Other Liabilities	136,36,87,000	Other Assets	42,79,77,000
	Rupees 876,08,34,000		Rupees 876,08,34,000

*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

†Includes Rs. 8,37,64,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 7th day of June, 1967.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 2nd day of June 1967.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department.	34,34,20,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	3060,86,60,000		(a) Held in India	115,89,25,000	
Total Notes issued		3095,20,80,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	186,42,01,000	
			TOTAL		302,31,26,000
			Rupee Coin		67,97,95,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		2724,91,59,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
TOTAL LIABILITIES		3095,20,80,000	TOTAL ASSETS		3095,20,80,000

Dated the 7th day of June, 1967

B. N. ADARKAR,
Dy. Governor.

[No. F.3(3)-BC/67.]

S. K. Mital, Under Secy.

(Department of Expenditure)*New Delhi, the 3rd June 1967*

S.O. 2020.—In exercise of the powers conferred by rules 111 and 114 of the Defence of India Rules, 1962, the Central Government hereby makes the following order in regard to the compensation payable for the stocks of rice or paddy which have been, or may be, requisitioned and acquired by the Government of West Bengal, namely:—

- (1) The rate of interest referred to in clause (i) of rule 111 of the said rules shall be four per cent per annum (simple interest).
- (2) The compensation, as determined under rule 112 of the said rule by the competent authority with reference to the variety, weight, quality and the like, of the rice or paddy stocks acquired shall become payable in one instalment within a period of three months from the date of acquisition.
- (3) The rate of interest referred to in the proviso to rule 114 of the said rules shall be four per cent per annum (simple interest), the interest accruing from the first day after the expiry of the period of three months from the date of acquisition.
- (4) The compensation shall be paid by crossed cheque on the local Treasury or sub-Treasury within a period of one month from the date of presentation of bills by the parties concerned to the competent authority without defects, or with defects rectified, or within one month of the date of issue of the order fixing the amount of compensation by the State Government, whichever is earlier.

[No. 1(21)-E(Coord)/66]

K. SANKARAN, Dy. Secy

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES**INCOME-TAX***New Delhi, the 2nd June 1967*

S.O. 2021.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendment in the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 105 (F. No. 50/14/66-ITJ) dated the 24th October, 1966, namely:—

Against Shillong Range, under column 2 the following shall be added:

8 Karimganj Circle.

This notification shall take effect from 19th June 1967

Explanatory Note

The amendment has become necessary on account of the creation of a new circle known as Karimganj Circle in the Commissioner's charge.

(The above note does not form part of the notification, but is intended to be merely clarificatory)

[No. 40 (F. No. 50/127/67 ITJ).]

T. N. PANDEY, Under Secy.

**OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE & LAND CUSTOMS:
PATNA***Patna, the 12th May 1967*

S.O. 2022.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby empower the Asstt. Collectors of Central Excise of this Collectorate to exercise within their respective jurisdiction, the power of 'Collector' under rule 53 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 as amended vide Government of India's Notification No. 162/66 dated 15th October 1966.

[No. 2/CX/67.]

TILAK RAJ, Collector.

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE: BANGALORE**CORRIGENDUM****CENTRAL EXCISES***Bangalore, the 20th May 1967*

S.O. 2023.—The limitation prescribed in Column 3 of this office Central Excise Notification No. 1/61, dated 18th March 1961 against Assistant Collectors under Rule 12-A of Central Excise Rules 1944, may please be read as follows:—

“In the case of exports through ports other than Bombay, Madras and Calcutta”

in lieu of the existing wordings “in the case of exports through ports other than major ports”,

(Issued from file C. No. IV/8/1/67-B.2)

C. T. A. PILLAI, Collector.

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION**(Department of Co-operation)***New Delhi, the 5th June 1967*

S.O. 2024.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5-B of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies Act, 1942 (6 of 1942) and in supersession of the notification No. 3-14/64-CT, dated the 17th April, 1965 of the Government of India, in the late Ministry of C.D. & C. (Department of Cooperation), the Central Government hereby directs that all the powers or authority exercisable by the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies under the said Act shall also be exercisable by Shri R. C. Gupta, Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Delhi in respect of Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies which are or are deemed to be actually registered in the Union Territory of Delhi.

[No. 7-13/66-Credit.]

S.O. 2025.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5-B of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies Act, 1942 (6 of 1942) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Community Development & Cooperation No. 3-17/62-CT, dated the 18th March, 1963, the Central Government hereby directs that all powers or authority exercisable by the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies under the said Act shall also be exercisable by Dr. Jose C. Almeida, Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Goa, Daman and Diu, in respect of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies which are or are deemed to be actually registered in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu.

[No. 7-13/66-Credit.]

V. V. NATHEN, Dy. Secy.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS**(P. & T. Board)***New Delhi, the 5th June 1967*

S.O. 2026.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the First July, 1967 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in NAVSARI Telephone Exchange.

[No. 5-27/67-PHB(2).]

D. R. BAHL,

Assistant Director General (PHB).

संचार विभाग

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून 1967

एस० नो० 2027 .—स्वायी आदेश क्रमसंख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गए 1951 के भारतीय तार नियमों के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने नक्सारि टेलीफोन केन्द्र में 1-7-1967 से प्रमाप्ति दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है ।

[सं० 5-27/67-पी० एच० बी० (2)]

डी० आर० बहल,

सहायक महानिदेशक (पी० एच० बी०)/

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

New Delhi, the 31st May, 1967

S.O. 2028.—In the matter of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890.

AND

In the matter of the Sir Mohammed Yusuf Scholarship Fund in connection with the Ismail Yusuf College, Jogheshwari, Bombay.

Whereas by a Resolution of the Government of Bombay in the Education Department No. S-34(1) dated the 12th August, 1942, a scheme has been approved for the administration of the Sir Mohammed Yusuf Scholarship Fund for giving scholarships to muslim students born and domiciled in the State of Bombay who passed the Matriculation or equivalent examination and prosecute their studies at the Ismail Yusuf College, Bombay;

And Whereas as a result of the reorganisation of the former State of Bombay, the objects of the endowment became extended to more than one state;

And Whereas the Principal, Ismail Yusuf College, Bombay being the person acting in the administration of the said Fund, has with the consent of the donor, applied for the modification of the said scheme so as to restrict the benefits of the Fund to muslim students who are born or domiciled in the State of Maharashtra and who prosecute their studies in the Ismail Yusuf College, Bombay;

Now Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the Scheme approved by the Resolution of the Government of Bombay in the Education the Department No. S-34 (1) dated the 12th August, 1942, namely:—

In the said Scheme, for paragraph 3, the following paragraph shall be substituted, namely:—

"3. The income of the said Fund shall be exclusively applied in providing scholarships for those muslim students born or domiciled in the State of Maharashtra who have passed the Matriculation or an equivalent examination under the rules for the time being in force and who prosecute one of the courses of studies at the Ismail Yusuf College, Jogheshwari, Bombay".

[No. F. 28-1/64-U.1. (U-5).]

S. NAGAPPA,

Assistant Educational Adviser.

शिक्षा मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 31 मई 1967

एस० ओ० 2029.—पूर्व धर्मादा अधिनियम 1890 के मामले में,

और

इस्माइल युसुफ कालेज, जोगेश्वरी, बम्बई के संबंध में सर मोहम्मद युसुफ छात्रवृत्ति निधि के मामले में—

जबकि, बम्बई सरकार, शिक्षा विभाग के एक संकल्प सं० एस-34(1), दिनांक 12-8-1942 के जरिए, बम्बई में उत्पन्न और अधिवासी उन मुस्लिम विद्यार्थियों को छात्रवृत्तियां देने के लिए सर मोहम्मद युसुफ छात्रवृत्ति निधि के प्रशासन के लिए एक योजना अनुमोदित की गई है जिन्होंने मैट्रिक अथवा उस के समकक्ष परीक्षा पास की हो और इस्माइल युसुफ कालेज, बम्बई में अपना अध्ययन करें;

और जबकि, भूतपूर्व बम्बई राज्य के पुनर्गठन के परिणामस्वरूप धर्मादा के उद्देश्य एक से अधिक राज्य में लागू हो गए हैं :—

और जबकि, इस्माइल युसुफ कालेज, बम्बई के प्रिंसिपल ने, उक्त निधि के प्रशासन के कार्यवाहक व्यक्ति के रूप में, दाता की सम्मति से, उपर्युक्त योजना में संशोधन करने के लिए आवेदन किया है ताकि निधि के लाभ उन मुस्लिम विद्यार्थियों तक ही सीमित रखे जाये जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य में उत्पन्न हुए हैं अथवा वहां के अधिवासी हो और जो इस्माइल युसुफ कालेज बम्बई में अपना अध्ययन करें :—

अब, इसलिए, पूर्व धर्मादा अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का छठा) की धारा 5 की उप धारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, बम्बई सरकार के शिक्षा विभाग के संकल्प सं० एस० 34(1), दिनांक 12-8-1942 द्वारा अनुमोदित योजना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उपर्युक्त योजना में, पैराग्राफ 3 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित पैराग्राफ लिख दिया जाए, अर्थात् :—

“3. उपर्युक्त निधि की आय का उपयोग केवल उन मुस्लिम विद्यार्थियों के लिए छात्रवृत्तियां प्रदान करने के लिए किया जाएगा जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य में उत्पन्न हुए हों अथवा वहां के अधिवासी हों तथा जिन्होंने उस समय प्रचलित नियमों के अन्तर्गत मैट्रिक अथवा उस के समकक्ष कोई परीक्षा पास की हो और इस्माइल युसुफ कालेज, जोगेश्वरी, बम्बई में किसी एक पाठ्यक्रम में अध्ययन करें।”

[स० एफ० 28-1/64-यू० I (यू० 5)].

एस० नागप्पा,

महायक शिक्षा सलाहकार ।

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Deputy Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, Goa)

ORDER

Panjim, the 26th May, 1967

S.O. 2030.—M/s. India Pharma Laboratories, Porvorim-Goa were granted an import licence No. P/SS/1500225C/XX/24/C/G/23-24 dated 20th January 1967 for Rs. 9,780/- They have applied for a duplicate exchange control purposes copy

of the licence on the ground that the original copy of the exchange control purposes copy of the licence has been lost or misplaced. It is further stated that the original exchange control purposes copy of the licence was not utilised at all. In support of this contention the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original exchange control purposes copy of the licence No. P/SS/1500225C/XX/24/C/G/23-24 dated 20th January 1967 has been lost or misplaced. Accordingly, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9(cc) of Import (Control) Order, 1955, as amended, I, K. Jayaraman, Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Panjim, Goa in the Ministry of Commerce, hereby cancel the original exchange control purposes copy of import licence No. P/SS/1500225C/XX/24/C/G/23-24 dated 20th January 1967 and direct that a duplicate exchange control purposes copy of the licence should be issued to the applicant for the full licence value of Rs. 9,780/- only.

[No. AU/SSI/21/AM.67.]

K. JAYARAMAN,

Dy Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 29th May 1967

S.O. 2031.—Whereas Messrs. Aravali Industries, City Post Office Road, Alwar or any bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient cause, against Notice No. A-29/66/ENF/CLA/3143, dated 13th March 1967 proposing to cancel Licence No. P/SS/1507025/C/XX/23/CD/23-24, dated 11th August 1966 for the import of Polythylene Moulding Powder for Rs. 15,482 granted to said M/s. Aravali Industries, City Post Office Road, Alwar by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports (Central Licensing Area), New Delhi, Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce in exercise of the powers conferred by the Clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the said licence No. P/SS/1507025/C/XX/23/CD/23-24, dated 11th August 1966 issued to M/s. Aravali Industries, City Post Office Road, Alwar.

M/s. Aravali Industries,
City Post Office Road,
Alwar

[No. A-29/66/ENF/CLA/1692.]

S.O. 2032.—Whereas Messrs. Rajasthan Plastic Industries, Sadar Bazar, Sirohi or any bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient cause, against Notice No. ENF/CLA/R-3/66/114, dated 13th April 1967 proposing to cancel licences No. (1) P/SS/1575507/C/XX/21/C-D/21-22, dated 22nd September 1966, valued at Rs. 2,362 for the import of Acrylic Plastic Sheets (2) P/SS/1575719/C/XX/23/C.D./23-24, dated 30th September 1966, valued at Rs. 12,000 for the import of Acrylic Plastic Sheets granted to said M/s. Rajasthan Plastic Industries, Sadar Bazar, Sirohi by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports (Central Licensing Area), New Delhi, Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce, in exercise of the powers conferred by the Clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the said licences No. P/SS/1575507/C/XX/21/CD/21-22, dated 22nd September 1966 and P/SS/1575719/C/XX/23/C.D./23-24, dated 30th September 1966, issued to M/s. Rajasthan Plastic Industries, Sadar Bazar, Sirohi.

M/s. Rajasthan Plastic Industries,
Sadar Bazar, Sirohi

[No. R-3/66/ENF/CLA/1648.]

K. RAJARAMAN,

Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 5th June 1967

S.O. 2033.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952), the Central Government hereby directs that the exhibition of the film, the name and other details of

which are given below and in respect of which a certificate for public exhibition has been granted by the Central Board of Film Censors, be suspended for a period of two months with effect from the date of issue of this notification:—

S. No.	Name of the film	No. and date of certificate	Name and address of the person in whose favour the certificate has been granted
1.	The Naked Prey (English)	1803-A Dt. 24-8-1966	Paramount films of India Ltd., Hague Building, sprott Road, Ballard Estate, <i>Bombay-1.</i>

[No. F. 9/9/67-FC.]

R. L. JAIN, Under Secy.

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY

New Delhi, the 9th June 1967

S.O. 2034.—Consequent on his revision to the West Bengal State Electricity Board, Shri S. N. Chatterjee relinquished charge of the post of Assistant Secretary, Eastern Regional Electricity Board, Patna, on the afternoon of the 31st May, 1967.

[No. 20/5/65-Adm. I.(CEA).]

M. M. DHAWAN, Under Secy.
for Chairman CEA.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 30th May 1967

S.O. 2035.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (1) of rule 5A of the Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms, 1956, the Central Government hereby appoints the Superintendent, Office of the Registrar of Companies, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad as prescribed authority for purposes of clause (a) of sub-section (1A) of section 108 of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956).

[No. F. 5/5/67-CL.V.]

F. N. SANYAL, Under Secy.

(Department of Industrial Development)

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 1st June 1967

S.O. 2036.—In licence No. CM/L-1128, dated 12 August 1965 held by the Calcutta Silk Manufacturing Co. Ltd., 23, B.T. Road, P.O. Sukchar (24 Parganas) having their office at 37, Vivekananda Road, Calcutta-7 the details of which are published under S.O. 2926 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated 1 October 1966, a new Variety No. 202 of Rayon Satin has been added with effect from 1 February 1967.

[No. MD/55.1128.]

S.O. 2037.—In licence No. CM/L-1210, dated 15 February 1966 held by M/s. Annapurna Biscuits (Mfg.) Co., 84/67, G.T. Road, Kanpur the details of which are published under S.O. 1039 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated 1 April 1967, the following new Varieties of biscuits have been added with effect from 1 May 1967:

- (i) Baby Glucose.
- (ii) Lunch Cream.
- (iii) Scout.

- (iv) Barley Cream
- (v) Barley
- (vi) Nice
- (vii) Picnic

[No MD/55 1210]

New Delhi, the 2nd June 1967

S. O. 2038.—In pursuance of sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established during the period 16 to 31 May, 1967.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl No	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Brief Particulars
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS : 1017—1966 Specification for chamois leather (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 1017—1962 Specification for chamois leather (<i>amended</i>)	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and tests for chamois leather used for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) filtering petrol ; (b) cleaning optical instruments and polished surfaces ; (c) lining or padding of leather goods; and (d) orthopaedic purposes (Price Rs. 4 00)
2	IS : 1026—1966 Specification for flexible trailing cables for use in quarries and metalliferous mines	—	This standard covers the requirements for the following types of cables : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) pliable armoured flexible cables suitable for use for working voltages of 650 volts to earth ; (b) pliable armoured flexible cables for earthed 3-phase system suitable for working voltages of 3,300 volts between conductors ; and (c) pliable armoured flexible cables for earthed 3-phase systems, suitable for working voltages of 6 600 volts between conductors. (Price Rs. 7.00)
3	IS : 1077—1966 Specification for common burnt clay building bricks (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 1077—1957 Specification for common burnt clay building bricks.	This specification lays down requirements for dimensions, quality and strength of common burnt clay building bricks used in building work (Price Rs 1 50).
4	IS : 1346—1966 Code of practice for waterproofing of roofs with bitumen felts (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 1346—1959 Code of practice for waterproofing of roofs with bitumen felts.	This standard deals with the methods of application of bitumen felts to roofs of buildings designed to render them waterproof (Price Rs. 5 00).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5	IS : 1989—1967 Specification for miners' safety leather boots and shoes (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 1989—1962 Specification for miner's boots and shoes.	This specification prescribes the requirements, methods of sampling and test for safety leather boots and shoes for miners with water resistant leather soles or moulded rubber soles, and the toes reinforced with steel toe-caps (Price Rs. 9.00).
6	IS : 2682—1966 Specification for chlordane emulsifiable concentrates (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 2682—1964 Specification for chlordane emulsion concentrates.	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for chlordane emulsifiable concentrates containing varying percentages of chlordane, technical (Price Rs. 6.00).
7	IS : 3067—1966 Code of practice for general design details and preparatory work for damp-proofing and water-proofing of buildings	—	This standard covers the essential details of design for damp-proofing and water-proofing of buildings and also the preparatory work, such as dewatering, surface preparation and other related works necessary, before application of the actual treatment (Price Rs. 5.50)
8	IS : 3150—1966 Specification for hexagonal wire netting for general purposes (<i>first revision</i>)	IS : 3150—1965 Specification for galvanized wire netting.	This standard lays down the requirements for hexagonal wire netting used for general purposes (Price Rs. 1.50).
9	IS : 3270—1966 Specification for stock and single fluke stock anchors (for harbour use)	—	This standard specifies the dimensions and material for stock and single fluke stock anchors (for harbour use) (Price Rs. 2.00).
10	IS : 3577—1967 Diameters of wrought aluminium and aluminium alloys, rivet, bolt and screw stock	—	This standard lays down diameters and tolerances on the diameters for wrought aluminium and aluminium alloys in the form of rivet, bolt and screw stock (Price Rs. 2.00).
11	IS : 3811—1966 Specification for rum	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for rum (Price Re. 1.00).
12	IS : 3824 (Part IV)—1966 Methods of evaluating dynamic load ratings of rolling bearings Part IV thrust roller bearings	—	This standard covers the method of evaluating dynamic load rating for thrust roller bearing (Price Re. 1.00).
13	IS : 3845—1966 Code of practice for joints used in wooden furniture	—	This standard covers the joints to be used in locations in various types of wooden furniture (Price Rs. 4.50).
14	IS : 3846—1966 Specification for rot-proofed cotton tapes for aeronautical purposes	—	This standard prescribes constructional details and other particulars of 8 varieties of cotton tapes, scoured, undyed or dyed and rot-proofed (Price Rs. 2.00).
15	IS : 3849—1966 Specification for mackerel (<i>Rastrelliger</i> sp.) canned in brine	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for mackerel (<i>Rastrelliger</i> sp.) canned in brine (Price Rs. 1.50).
16	IS : 3859—1966 Method for determination of strength of water soluble azo dyes by reduction with titanium trichloride	—	This standard prescribes a method for determination of strength of water soluble azo dyes by reduction with titanium trichloride. (Price Rs. 2.00).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17	IS : 3860—1966 Specification for precast cement concrete slabs for canal linings.	—	This standard lays down requirement for precast cement concrete slabs for canal lining (Price Re. 1.00).
18	IS : 3864—1966 Specification for mobile kit for milk testing.	—	This standard prescribes the apparatus and reagents which may be conveniently kept in a mobile kit for rapid examination of milk (Price Rs. 2.00).
19	IS : 3867 —1966 Specification for rubber ice bags	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of sampling and tests for ice bags made from natural rubber or synthetic rubber, or a blend of the two (Price Rs. 3.50).
20	IS 3879—1967 Specification for wax spatula, dental.	—	This standard specifies the requirements for wax spatula (Price Rs. 2.00).
21	IS : 3902—1966 Specification for dimethoate, technical.	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for dimethoate technical, employed in the preparation of insecticidal formulations (Price Rs. 6.00).
22	IS : 3903—1966 Specification for dimethoate emulsifiable concentrates.	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for dimethoate emulsifiable concentrates (Price Rs. 6.50).
23	IS : 3910—1966 Specification for current meters (cup type) for water flow measurement.	—	This standard deals with the rotating cup type of current meters, axis of rotation normal to the flow, their functional requirements, materials to be used in their manufacture, performance tests and packing (Price Rs. 5.00).
24	IS : 3920—1966 Methods of sampling of cotton yarn for determination of physical characteristics.	—	This standard prescribes the methods of sampling for cotton yarn for determination of physical characteristics, namely, yarn count, skein-breaking load and twist. It specifies the number of tests that should be made for each characteristic. It also lays down the criteria for ascertaining the conformity of the yarn to the specified requirements for the characteristics (Price Rs. 2.00).
25	IS : 3922—1965 Recommendations for ghee refinery.	—	This standard recommends the general layout plan, constructional details and other requirements and equipment for a ghee refinery handling 10 to 60 quintals of ghee per melt (Price Rs. 5.00).
26	IS : 3930—1966 Specification for flame and induction hardening steels.	—	This standard covers the requirements for wrought unalloyed and alloyed steels for flame and induction hardening (Price Rs. 6.00).
27	IS : 3931—1966 Specification for sound level meters for the measurement of noise emitted by motor vehicles.	—	This standard specifies the characteristics of the sound level meters employed for the measurement of noise emitted by motor vehicles in accordance with IS : 3028—1965. (Price Rs. 4.00).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
28	IS : 3935—1966 Code of practice for composite construction.	—	This standard deals with the design and construction of composite structures made up of prefabricated structural unit and cast-in-situ concrete. The prefabricated units may consist of steel members or prestressed or reinforced concrete, precast members (Price Rs. 8.00).
29	IS : 3966—1967 Specification for DW-flour jute cloth.	—	This standard prescribes the constructional details and other particulars of DW-flour jute cloth (Price Rs. 2.00)
30	IS : 3989—1967 Specification for centrifugally cast (spun) iron spigot and socket soil, waste and ventilating pipes.	—	This standard covers the requirements for centrifugally cast (spun) iron spigot and socket soil, waste and ventilating pipes suitable for use above ground only (Price Rs. 2.50).
31	IS : 4028—1965 Specification for beeswax, bleached, for cosmetic industry.	—	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for beeswax bleached, of Indian origin for cosmetic industry (Price Rs. 5.50).
32	IS : 4038—1967 Specification for foot valves for water works purpose.	—	This standard covers requirements for flanged and screwed-end foot valves of both swing and lift type for use with centrifugal pumps for water works purposes. It covers screwed end valves from 25 to 150 mm nominal sizes and flanged-end valves from 50 to 450 mm nominal sizes (Price Rs. 4.00).

Copies of these Indian Standards are available, for sale, with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1 and also its branch offices at (i) Bombay Mutual Terrace First Floor, 534 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Road, Ecmatay 7, (ii) Third and Fourth Floors, 5 Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13, (iii) Second Floor, Sathya-murthi Bhavan, 54 General Patters Road, Madras-2 and (iv) 117/418-B Sarvodaya Nagar Kanpur.

New Delhi, the 5th June 1967

S. O. 2039.—In pursuance of regulation 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that amendment(s) to the Indian Standard(s) given in the schedule hereto annexed have been issued under the powers conferred by the sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 3 of the said Regulations

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No	No. and title of the Indian Standard amended	No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which the establishment of the Indian Standard was notified.	No. and Date of the Amendment	Brief particulars of the Amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	IS: 455—1962 Specification for portland blast furnace slag cement (<i>revised</i>).	S.O. 2838 dated 15 September 1962	No. 2 April 1967	Clause 0.7 has been substituted by a new one.	15 June, 1967.
2	IS: 613—1964 Specification for copper rods for electrical purposes (<i>revised</i>).	S.O. 735 dated 6 March 1965	No. 2 April 1967	(i) Page 4, clause 1.1, line 2—Substitute '(a)' for '(o)'; (ii) Page 6, Table I, col. 1, first entry—Substitute 'a' for 'o';	Immediate effect.
3	IS: 1489—1962 Specification for portland-pozzolana cement.	S.O. 2976 dated 29 September 1962.	No. 1 April 1967	Clause 0.7 has been substituted by a new one	
4	IS: 2180—1962 Specification for heavy-duty burnt clay building bricks.	S.O. 483 dated 16 February 1963	No. 2 May 1967	(i) Clause 2.2 and the informal table under clause 3.2 have been substituted by new ones (ii) Clauses 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 have been amended. (iii) A new clause 6 has been added.	15 June, 1967.
5	IS: 2347—1966 Specification for domestic pressure cookers (<i>revised</i>).	S.O. 469 dated 11 February 1967.	No. 1 May 1967	Clause 8.1 has been amended	Immediate effect.
6	IS: 2655—1964 Method for tensile testing of copper and copper alloy tube.	S.O. 83 dated 2 January 1965.	No. 1 April 1967	Fig. 1 has been substituted by a new one.	15 June, 1967

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
7	IS: 2691—1964 Specification for burnt clay facing bricks.	S.O. 2874 dated 22 August 1964	No. 1 May 1967	(i) A new sentence has been added at the end of clause 2.1. (ii) The informal tables under clause 3.2 and clause 8.1 have been substituted by new ones.	
8	IS : 2994—1965 Specification for electric stoves.	S.O. 3059 dated 2 October 1965	No. 3. February 1967	Page 9, clause 10.2—Add the following at the end of the clause : 'All the tests shall be carried out with the metal guard in position.'	
9	IS:—3200—1965 Methods of chemical analysis of cryolite.	S.O. 1081 dated 9 April 1966	No. 1 April 1967	Clause 8 3.2 has been substituted by a new one.	15 June, 1967
10	IS: 3460—1966 Specification for knurled nuts.	S.O. 3818 dated 17 December 1966	No. 1 March 1967	Table 1 has been amended.	
11	IS: 3795—1966 Specification for fenugreek, whole.	S.O. 469 dated 11 February, 1967	No. 1 April 1967	Page 5, Table 1, col. 5, against Sl. No. (ii)—Substitute '1 0' for '1.5'.	15 June, 1967


Copies of these Amendment slips are available, free of cost, with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1 and also its branch offices at (i) Bombay Mutual Terrace, First Floor, 534 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Road, Bombay-7, (ii) Third and Fourth Floors, 5 Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13, (iii) Second Floor, Sathyamurthi Bhavan, 54, General Patters Road, Madras-2 and (iv) 117/418-B Sarvodaya Nagar, Kanpur.

[No.MD'13:5]

S. O. 2040.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark, design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1 April, 1967 :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the Design of the Standard Mark
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	<p>IS : 2486</p> 	Insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 kV and above.	IS: 2486 (Parts I & II)—1963 Specification for insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 kV and above Part I general requirements and tests. Part II dimensional requirements.	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2.]

S.O. 2041.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 kV and above details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 1 April, 1967.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 kV and above	IS : 2486 (Parts I & II)—1963 Specification for insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 kV and above Part I general requirements and tests Part II dimensional requirements	One metric tonne	Rs. 100.00 per unit for the first 25 units ; Rs. 50.00 per unit for the next 25 units Rs. 10.00 per unit for the next 25 units ; Rs. 5.00 per unit for the subsequent production .

[No. MD/18: 2.]

DR. SADGOPAL,
Deputy Director General.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 5th June 1967

S.O. 2042.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ramnagar Colliery, Post Office Pandaveswar (District Burdwan) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st May, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, CALCUTTA.

REFERENCE No. 52 of 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Ramnagar Colliery,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Sen.—*Presiding Officer.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers.—Shri Monoj Kumar Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen.—Shri Patit Paban Pathak.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY Coal Mines

AWARD

By Order No. 6/94/64-LR-II dated 14th September, 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Ramnagar Colliery, P.O. Pandaveswar, Dist. Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the subject matter mentioned in the following schedule:

"Whether the action of the management of Ramnagar Colliery in dismissing Shri Shyam Kishore Gope, Bunker Sirkar with effect from the 21st March, 1964 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The workman concerned, Shyam Kishore Gope, obtained service as a peon at Ramnagar colliery in 1958 and obtained promotion to the post of Sand Munshi or Bunker Sirkar in 1962. He was served with a chargesheet on 11th March, 1964 that he was late in attending to his duty in the third shift of 5th March, 1964 and that on 6th March 1964 about 7 30 a.m. he abused and threatened to assault the general in-charge of the colliery, Bhawar Singh, in the presence of Shri Amar Chatterjee, Sand Line-in-charge. Shyam Kishore sent a reply on the same date, 11th March 1964 denying the allegations contained in the chargesheet and stating that the charges had been brought falsely in order to victimise him as he had refused to give up union membership.

3. Notice of the enquiry was given on 13th March, 1964 fixing 16th March, 1964 for enquiry but Shyam Kishore did not appear on that day. Accordingly the Enquiring Officer, R. Ramachandran Group Labour Officer, adjourned the enquiry to 19th March, 1964 3 p.m. and a fresh notice was given on 17th March, 1964 to Shyam Kishore but on the adjourned date of enquiry. Shyam Kishore again failed to appear, and the Enquiring Officer after waiting for some time held the enquiry ex-parte, in the course of which he examined 5 witnesses including Bhawar Singh, the general in-charge and Amar Chatterjee, Sand Line in-charge. The Enquiring Officer stated in his report that he held the enquiry in relation to one charge, namely intimidating and threatening to cut the head of the in-charge and threatening to assault him on 6th March, 1964. The charge of late attendance for the 3rd shift on 5th March, 1964 was dropped. The Enquiring Officer in his report submitted on 20th March, 1964 stated that the charge, of intimidating and threatening to assault the in-charge, Bhawar Singh, was fully proved. The manager with the approval of the Chief Mining Engineer, Samla Collieries Limited passed an order of dismissal on 21st March, 1964 on Shyam Kishore Gope.

4. The case of the union on behalf of the workman is that Shyam Kishore was an active member of the branch of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha which had been opened recently at Ramnagar, and that the management had grudge again at all the workmen who took an active part in the newly set up union which was known as Lal jhanda union, and that therefore false allegations were made against Shyam Kishore Gope in order to get rid of him. The union alleged that on receiving the first notice dated 13th March, 1964 Shyam Kishore had written to the Manager requesting that either Dinesh Singh or Robin Chatterjee might be allowed to assist him at the enquiry, but that no reply was received to that letter except the second notice dated 17th March, 1964 notifying that the enquiry would be held on 19th March, 1964 at 3 p.m.; that again on 18th March, 1964 the workman wrote a letter repeating his prayer that Dinesh Singh or Robin Chatterjee might be permitted to help him at the enquiry; but without sending any reply the management held an ex-parte enquiry on 19th March, 1964. According to the union, therefore, the order of dismissal is not sustainable and it is further a case of victimisation of workman for union activities.

5. According to the management, however, though they did not recognise the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha at the Ramnagar Colliery, and they recognised two other unions which were functioning at the colliery from before, it was not at all true that the case had been falsely started against Shyam Kishore because he took an active part in the newly started union, the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. According to the management, the workman Shyam Kishore was showing signs of indiscipline and bad temper after being promoted to the post of Sand Munshi, and four chargesheets had to be served on him for various misconducts, on 12th November, 1962, 26th November, 1962, 15th June, 1963 and 7th October, 1963 respectively. On the last occasion the manager Shri K. C. Roy recommended his dismissal but the agent was kind enough to give Shyam Kishore another chance and altered the punishment of one of suspension for 10 days. On the present occasion the chargesheet was drawn up against the workman as he had been late in attendance in the third shift of 5th March, 1964 and had also abused the in-charge in violent language in the morning of 6th March, 1964, and it was

for the latter charge that he was dismissed. According to the management the order of dismissal was perfectly justified in view of the previous history of the workman.

6. The workman admitted having received the chargesheet dated 11th March, 1964 on the same date and also the two notices fixing date of enquiry namely Ext. 2 dated 13th March, 1964 and Ext. 2(a) dated 17th March, 1964. According to the workman, he wrote a letter after receiving each notice for allowing Dinesh Singh or Robin Chatterjee to help him at the enquiry but the management did not send any reply to these letters. According to the management however the management received only one such letter, viz. Ext. B dated 18th March, 1964 which was received by the management on 20th March, 1964 when the enquiry was already over. Shyam Kishore in his deposition before the tribunal stated that the reply to the first notice was sent by him by post and the reply to the second notice was handed over personally to the Labour Officer, Shri Verma. It appears however from the written statement of the union dated 28th September, 1964 which was filed before the Conciliation Officer, a copy of which was received with the failure report, that the case of the union then was that the workman wrote a letter on 16th March, 1964 on receiving the first notice and that the second letter dated 18th March, 1964 was sent by registered post. If the second letter was sent by registered post, it is quite likely that the management should have received it on 20th March, 1964 as stated by Shri Ramachandran in his deposition before the tribunal. Apart from Shyam Kishore's own evidence there is nothing to show that any letter was really sent on receiving the first notice. That another letter like Ext. B had been received has been denied by Shri Ramachandran. In any case, whether a letter had been written or not by Shyam Kishore before he sent the letter, Ext. B dated 18th March, 1964 by registered post, there is not sufficient reason why Shyam Kishore did not attend the enquiry which was held on 19th March, 1964 at 3 p.m. The statement of the workman, that he tried to ascertain from the colliery office when the enquiry would really be held and that one morning he was informed by Amar Babu and others that the enquiry had already been held in the previous evening and that they had been asked to sign certain statements but that they did not know what was written there, cannot at all be accepted as credible. After the workman had sent the letter of 18th March, 1964 by registered post, it is not likely that he should have gone personally to know from the Enquiring Officer when the enquiry would be held; neither is it likely that Amar Chatterjee who had deposed at the *ex-parte* enquiry and spoken about the charge of abusing and assaulting the general in-charge should have told the workman on the next morning that he had signed a statement of which the contents he did not know. The evidence of Shri Ramachandran is that he examined 5 witnesses and he cross-examined them himself to ascertain the truth. The record of the enquiry, Ext. C, shows that the witnesses were in fact cross examined by the Enquiring Officer. I must hold that the enquiry was properly held.

7. Shri Pathak appearing on behalf of the union has urged that since the charge of late attendance at the third shift of 5th March, 1964 was given up, the second charge must also be regarded as unsustainable, because according to the chargesheet it was when the in-charge was speaking to Amar Babu about late attendance that Shyam Kishore is supposed to have intervened and threatened and intimidated the in-charge Bhawar Singh. I must hold however that the two charges are separate and not dependant on one another. The evidence of Bhawar Singh before the Enquiring Officer shows that what Bhawar Singh had been relating to Amar Chatterjee in the morning of 6th March, 1964 was not so much that Shyam Kishore was late in attending his duty in the night of 5th March, 1964, but that at night towards the beginning of the shift Shyam Kishore had talked insolently to Bhawar Singh. Bhawar Singh's evidence was that on 5th March, 1964, a little after midnight when he was sleeping, he heard a man saying 'Babu Babu', and Bhawar Singh asked him what he wanted, and that the man replied that he wanted Shyam Kishore Munshi, and Bhawar Singh told him that Shyam Kishore lived in the adjoining quarters and he might call there; that after about an hour or so he again heard a man calling 'Babu-Babu' and Bhawar Singh opened the door and came out and saw Judhistir Behara and another man, and Bhawar Singh told them not to disturb him if they wanted Shyam Kishore; and then Shyam Kishore Munshi came out from his house and demanded to know what had happened and why Bhawar Singh was shouting doing 'fatar-fatar'. Bhawar Singh then closed the door and went back to his bed. Next morning at 7.30 a.m. he was speaking about that incident to Amar Chatterjee when Shyam Kishore spoke insolently to him and threatened to assault him. It appears from the above evidence that Shyam Kishore was late in going to his duty because at one hour after midnight he had to be called from his house, but it is also clear that the stress of Bhawar Singh's evidence was not on Shyam Kishore being late but on Shyam Kishore being insolent at night. I am for this that the Enquiring Officer

appears to have dropped the charge of late attendance because there was no direct evidence as to when he had reported for duty; and only dealt with the charge of intimidating and threatening to assault the in-charge Bhawar Singh. In the circumstances, it is clear that the charge of intimidating and threatening to assault the in-charge cannot fall merely because the charge of late attendance was dropped.

7. Next, Shri Pathak has pointed out that while the Enquiring Officer only found the delinquent workman guilty of the charge of intimidating and threatening to assault the in-charge Bhawar Singh, the manager in his letter of dismissal, Ext. 3 dated 21st March, 1964, stated that he was satisfied that the misconduct as mentioned in the chargesheet had been sufficiently established against Shyam Kishore and then proceeded to pass the order of dismissal. Shri Pathak has urged that misconduct mentioned in the chargesheet includes both late attendance on 5th March and intimidating and threatening to assault Bhawar Singh on 6th March, and if the manager proceeded on the footing that both the charges mentioned in the chargesheet were proved, the order of dismissal passed by him cannot be sustained. It appears however that the Manager merely used somewhat inaccurate language in the order of dismissal. Ext. 3, he was actually aware of the fact that the Enquiring Officer had found Shyam Kishore guilty of one charge namely intimidating and threatening to assault the in-charge Bhawar Singh. This appears from the report, Ext. E which the manager sent to the Chief Mining Engineer on 20th March, 1964 when forwarding the enquiry proceedings and the report of the Enquiring Officer to the C.M.E. for his approval to the order of dismissal. Therein the manager stated clearly that Shyam Kishore was charge-sheeted for abusing and threatening Bhawar Singh, General in-charge on 6th March, 1964 and that at the enquiry held *ex-parte* the charge had been fully proved against Shyam Kishore. I hold therefore that the order of dismissal as passed by the Manager cannot be held to be bad on the ground urged by Shri Pathak.

8 Shri Pathak has finally mentioned that in the chargesheet except the in-charge and Amar Babu no other witness is mentioned and it is not unlikely that the three other witnesses examined, Juthistir Behara, Satish Mondal and Dataram Das were subsequently procured in order to support the charge. It is not however necessary that in the chargesheet all the witnesses should be mentioned. It is sufficient that the two persons directly concerned namely, Bhawar Singh and Amar Chatterjee were mentioned. Other witnesses appear to be natural witnesses. Juthistir Behara was a Sand Line Labour Sirdar and Satish Mondal a Line Mistri and Dataram Das a line mazdoor. They were all working in the sand line and it was natural for them to be present in the neighbourhood of the sand bunker where the incident took place at 7-30 A.M. on 6th March, 1964. There is therefore no substance in this point also.

9. The previous chargesheets against the workman were mentioned by Shri Ramachandra but it was not considered necessary to admit documentary evidence relating to them. But in respect of the last one of them dated 7th October, 1963, the Manager's recommendation for dismissal was admitted, being Ext. F and the agent's reply dated 13th December 1963 was admitted being marked, Ext. F1, wherein the agent stated that he felt that Shyam Kishore should be given one more chance and that the period of suspension might be treated as punishment. It appears, therefore, that the management was not showing any vindictive attitude against Shyam Kishore Gope. There is no evidence at all in support of the contention of the Union that because Shyam Kishore Gope took a prominent part in connection with the unit of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha at Ramnagar Colliery, the management was dissatisfied with him. Shyam Kishore stated that after he had received the order of dismissal, the Labour Officer Shri Verma sent for him on that day and told him that because of his making representations to the management about the grievances of workmen he was being charge-sheeted from time to time. It is clear that such evidence cannot be believed because after he had been dismissed, the Labour Officer had no reason to send for him and speak to him against the management.

10 My award therefore is that the action of the management of Ramnagar Colliery in dismissing Shyam Kishore Gope, Bunker Sirkar with effect from the 21st March, 1964 was justified and therefore the workman is not entitled to any relief.

Dated, 23rd May, 1967.

S. K. SEN,
Presiding Officer.
[No. 6/94/64-LRIL.]

S.O. 2043.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ramnagar Colliery, Post Office Pandaveswar, District Burdwan and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 1st June, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 70 of 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Ramnagar Colliery

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Sen.—*Presiding Officer.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers.—Shri Monoj Kumar Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen.—Shri P. P. Pathak.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

By order No. 6/96/64-LRII dated 20th November, 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Ramnagar Colliery, P. O. Pandaveswar, Distt. Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the subject matter mentioned in the following schedule:

“(i) Whether the dismissal of Shri Dudhnath Rajbhar, Timber Mazdoor, with effect from the 11th May, 1964 by the management of Ramnagar Colliery, was an act of victimisation?

(ii) If so, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The workman Dudhnath Rajbhar was employed as a timber mazdoor at Ramnagar Colliery. According to the case of the management, an Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia went down into the mine for inspection on 20th April, 1964 at about 10 A.M. Dudhnath had duty in the first shift on that day from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M. The Assistant Manager at 10-30 A.M. found Dudhnath sleeping and woke him up, and demanded why he was sleeping on duty and told him that he would get only half hazri or credit for half day's attendance on that day. Dudhnath Rajbhar got very angry and assaulted the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia, with a rolla or log of wood. He also went to the surface shortly thereafter without obtaining permission from the Mining Sirdar or Overman. Accordingly, Dudhnath Rajbhar was chargesheeted on 21st April, 1964, the charges mentioned being (i) sleeping on duty on 20th April, 1964 at about 10-30 A.M. (ii) assaulting the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia and (iii) leaving the work place before the end of the shift without permission. The chargesheet was sought to be served by Peon Book on Dudhnath, but Dudhnath refused to accept the chargesheet from the peon on 22nd April, 1964. Thereafter a copy of the chargesheet was sent by registered post, but that also was returned refused. Dudhnath however received the notice of enquiry dated 29th April, 1964 and thereafter he wrote a letter on 1st May, 1964 asking for a copy of the chargesheet and asking for permission for Kalanand Singh Bonus Clerk of Samla Colliery to appear and help him at the enquiry. The management replied on 2nd May, 1964 refusing the request for the appearance of Kalanand Singh to help Dudhnath at the enquiry, but send a copy of the chargesheet, which was received by Dudhnath on 3rd May, 1964. Thereafter an enquiry was held on 4th May, 1964, as notified, by R. N. Srivastava who was then the Labour Welfare Officer at Kendra Colliery. The Labour Welfare Officer submitted his report on 8th May, 1964, finding that the charges had been proved. The Manager then reported to the C.M.E. recommending dismissal; and approval of the C.M.E. having been obtained, the Manager passed an order of dismissal on 11th May, 1964 on Dudhnath Rajbhar.

3. According to the written statement filed by the Union on behalf of the workman, Dudhnath Rajbhar was an active member of the unit of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha at Ramnagar, being one of the local leaders of the Union at Ramnagar; and on 20th April, 1964 when the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia went for inspection into the

mine, he asked Dudhnath who was then working to leave the Laljhanda Union, and when Dudhnath refused the Assistant Manager beat him with his stick, so that thereafter Dudhnath was not able to attend to his duty for 3 days. He wrote a letter on 21st April, 1964 to the Manager of Ramnagar Colliery complaining about such beating by the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia. Thereafter the workman went to join his work on 24th April, 1964, but he was not allowed to join his duty. On 29th April, 1964 he received the notice of enquiry in respect of a chargesheet dated 21st April, 1964 but in the mean time he had not received any copy of the chargesheet according to the written statement no copy of the chargesheet had ever been tendered to him; and therefore he wrote back to the Manager asking for a copy of the chargesheet and asking for the assistance of Kalanand Singh at the enquiry. He received a reply from the Manager refusing the assistance of Kalanand Singh at the enquiry but he received a copy of the chargesheet only after the enquiry was over. As to the enquiry, the case of the Union was that the witnesses of the workman, particularly Kado Mistry and Narayan Mahato, were not allowed to be examined, and accordingly the enquiry was not a proper enquiry. According to the Union, the order of dismissal was *malafide* and amounted to victimisation of the workman for his active participation in the trade union movement, viz. the Laljhanda Union which the management did not recognise.

4. The record of the enquiry proceedings held on 4th May, 1964 by R. N. Srivastava, Labour Welfare Officer is Ext. B and the report of the Enquiring Officer dated 8th May, 1964 is Ext. C. These documents show that apart from Dudhnath Rajohar who gave a long statement in defence, 4 other witnesses were examined for defence, including Kado Mistry and Narayan Mahato. It is not correct, therefore, that the management did not permit the examination of defence witnesses and in particular of Kado Mistry and Narayan Mahato. On behalf of the Union, Shri Pathak has pointed out that the Enquiring Officer himself has not been examined. This was explained by the management by reference to the evidence of Sri Ramchandran, Group Labour Officer of Samla Collieries Ltd. He stated that R. N. Srivastava had left the service of Samla Collieries Ltd. in the early part of 1965 and his whereabouts were not known to the management. That the enquiry was held is admitted in the written statement of the Union, as also by the workman, Dudhnath Rajbhar in his deposition before the tribunal. Dudhnath Rajbhar stated that the enquiry lasted from 9 A.M. to 12 noon and that Kado Mistry and Narayan Mahato were examined at the enquiry. Further, though the Enquiring Officer could not be brought and the Group Labour Officer, Ramchandran was not himself present at the enquiry, the management produced one witness who was present throughout the enquiry, namely MW 2 Nepal Chandra Mukherjee, Pay Clerk of the Samla Collieries Ltd. He stated that he was distributing pay in the same room as the room where the enquiry was being held by R. N. Srivastava, and he heard the statements of witnesses being read over and explained in Hindi by the Enquiring Officer and at the request of the Enquiring Officer he put his signature below each of the statements recorded at the enquiry. He showed his signature below each of the statements. In the circumstances, the authenticity of the record of the enquiry proceedings, Ext. B, cannot be challenged. This record shows that the enquiry was properly held and that opportunity was given to the workmen to cross examine management's witnesses and examine defence witness apart from giving his own statement in detail.

5. An important point in the Reference case is whether there was victimisation for trade union activities. Dudhnath in his evidence before the tribunal stated that when the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia, came for inspection on 20th April 1964, Dudhnath was not found sleeping and that what actually took place was that the Assistant Manager asked Dudhnath to give up membership of the Laljhanda Union, and on his refusal he beat him with a stick. Such an allegation was also made by Dudhnath in the letter addressed to the C.M.E., Ext. 3 dated, 20th April, 1964. But it is to be noted that a letter to the C.M.E. dated, 20th April 1964 is not mentioned in the Union's written statement; a letter to the Manager dated 21st April, 1964 is mentioned therein, but no such letter was produced. Further it appears that none of the defence witness at the enquiry supported that part of the defence case. Kado Mistry stated that he had asked Dudhnath to make 'Gutka' i.e. wooden pags used to fix the timber posts, and he himself was sitting and preparing 'khaini' when the Assistant Manager came up and charged Kado Mistry with keeping his men sitting, and the Assistant Manager hit Dudhnath on the stomach with his stick and stopped him from doing work. In cross examination he said that Dudhnath at that time was fanning himself and not sleeping. The evidence of Narayan Mahato is in the same strain. The other witnesses examined for defence spoke on another point viz. that Dudhnath had fallen down when he came running from his place of work. It appears from the evidence of Kado Mistry and Narayan Mahato that there was no talk at all about

Dudhnath being a member of the Laljhanda Union and being asked to give up that Union. He was prodded or beaten with a stick by the Assistant Manager because he was sleeping or at least sitting idle when he was supposed to be doing work. Hence the case of victimisation because of membership of the Laljhanda Union falls to the ground.

6 On scrutiny of the proceedings of the enquiry it must be held that the enquiry was properly held and there was evidence to support the findings made by the Enquiring Officer that the charges were proved. Shri Pathak has urged that the management was wrong in not allowing Kalanand Singh to help Dudhnath at the enquiry, but the management has given the reason, namely that under the Standing Orders a worker can have the assistance of another workman working at the same colliery and that Kalanand Singh was working as a clerk at Samla Colliery and not at Ramnagar Colliery. Therefore, it must be held that the management was right in refusing the assistance of Kalanand Singh to Dudhnath at the enquiry. Shri Pathak has also urged that even assuming that Dudhnath had received a copy of the chargesheet on 31st May 1964 as was sought to be proved by the management from the evidence of Sri Ramachandran and the Peon Book entry, Ext F/3 no time was given thereafter to Dudhnath to submit a reply to the charges mentioned in the chargesheet, and the enquiry was held on the following day, 4th May 1964, without obtaining a reply. But no blame could be attached to the management for not giving any further time for submitting a reply to the chargesheet, because it is clear from the evidence of Sri Ramachandran and the Peon Book entry Ext F/1 that the chargesheet was sought to be served on the workman concerned by Peon Book on 21st April 1964 and 22nd April 1964, and on 21st April 1964 the workman could not be found and on 22nd April 1964 he was found but refused to accept the copy of the chargesheet. A copy of the chargesheet was sent by registered post but it was also refused, vide Ext A. Thus Dudhnath was himself to blame if he did not have opportunity to give his reply in writing before the enquiry was held. In any case this did not prejudice Dudhnath because he gave a long statement in defence at the enquiry and also examined 4 witnesses on his own behalf. He went prepared for the defence and must have known what the charges were against him. Shri Pathak has urged that there is a discrepancy as to the place of occurrence, for whereas the chargesheet suggests that the Assistant Manager, P. K. Bhatia, was assaulted at the place of work of Dudhnath Rajbhar, actually the evidence shows that the assault with a rolla or log of wood was made near the pit bottom just as the Assistant Manager was about to get into the cage to come out of the pit. On this point there is the evidence of Bhadu Singh and Sukhram, two of the witnesses examined for the management at the enquiry held on 4th May 1964. Bhadu Singh, a Pit Sirkar, stated that he was doing his duty in the first shift of 20th April 1964 and he saw Dudhnath coming with a rolla or log of wood in his hand, and Dudhnath stated that Chota Sahib had beaten him and he would not leave Chota Sahib without a beating, in the meantime the Gomasta Babu came up and hearing Dudhnath asked him not to beat Chota Sahib, and also asked Bhadu and Sukhram to escort Chota Sahib to the pit bottom; but when Bhadu Singh and Sukhram were escorting Chota Sahib to the pit bottom and were asking the onsetter to bring down the cage quickly so that Chota Sahib might go up from the pit to the surface Dudhnath suddenly came up from the main gallery and struck the Assistant Manager Bhatia on the leg with a rolla, and as he lifted the rolla a second time, Bhadu Singh and Sukhram caught hold of the rolla and prevented further injury to the Chota Sahib. The chargesheet does not make it clear that the assault took place at the pit bottom when the Assistant Manager was waiting for the cage to come down and take him up, but rather suggests that the assault took place as soon as P. K. Bhatia woke up. This however does not go to show that the charge of assault was not proved. Not only was there the evidence of P. K. Bhatia and Bhadu Singh and Sukhram on the point but also the medical certificate which was admitted as an exhibit at the enquiry being marked Ext A. It must be held immaterial that in the chargesheet the place of assault was not precisely stated.

7 Shri Pathak has also referred to a discrepancy between the medical evidence and the evidence of Bhadu Singh and Sukhram. Whereas the medical certificate marked Ext A at the enquiry shows that P. K. Bhatia was found to have an Echymosis on the right calf muscle with swelling both Bhadu Singh and Sukhram stated that Chota Sahib was assaulted on the left leg. This must however be considered a minor discrepancy. Moreover, where there is evidence to support the findings, the tribunal cannot sit in appeal over the findings made by the Enquiring Officer. As I have pointed out, the enquiry was held properly and the findings being supported by some evidence, must be upheld. The order

of dismissal was passed with the approval of the Chief Mining Engineer as required by the Standing Orders and there is no reliable evidence at all to show that the proceedings were started against Dudhnath Rajbhar because of taking an active part in Laljhanda Union or the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. It appears that P. K. Bhatia acted improperly in hitting the workman Dudhnath Rajbhar with a stick and was partly responsible for what followed, and he deserves censure for his conduct; but this cannot justify Dudhnath way laying Bhatia and suddenly striking him with a rolla as Bhatia was waiting for the cage to come down to the pit bottom.

8. Accordingly, my award is that the dismissal of Shri Dudhnath Rajbhar, Timber mazdoor, with effect from 11th May, 1964 by the management of Ramnagar Colliery was not an act of victimisation and accordingly the workman is not entitled to any relief.

The 30th May 1967.

S. K. Sen,
Presiding Officer.
[No. 6/96/64-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 6th June 1967

S.O. 2044.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta. In the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st May, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 9 OF 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Sen.—*Presiding Officer.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of employers.—Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

On behalf of workmen.—Absent.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines

AWARD

By order No. 6/83/64-LRII dated 26th February, 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, P.O. Dishergarh, Distt. Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the subject matter mentioned in the following schedule:

"Whether the dismissal from service of Shri Nabni Dhar Dutta, Mechanical Fitter with effect from the 16th July, 1964 by the management of the Girimint Colliery was with a view to victimise the workman for his trade union activities? If so, to what relief is he entitled?"

2. Nabni Dhar Dutta used to work as a mechanical fitter at Girimint Colliery; he had put in 14 years service according to the written statement of the union and 11 years service according to the written statement of the management. On 15th June, 1964 he was chargesheeted, the charge against him being that on 9th June, 1964 he removed a Bladon Portable Face Pump from No. 2 Pit and disposed of the same, the original value of the stolen pump being Rs. 1,480. The workman replied on 18th June, 1964 denying the charge of theft and alleging that the charge was concocted to harass him as he was a member of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. The reply was not considered satisfactory and the workman was given notice that an enquiry would be held on 25th June, 1964. The enquiry was held by Shri M. L. Kapur who was then the Welfare Officer of Girimint Colliery and

the workman was preseat at the enquiry. After holding the enquiry Shri Kapur submitted his report holding that the charge had been proved. After obtaining the approval of the Chief Mining Engineer, Shri M. R. Kamra, Manager passed an order of dismissal on the workman Nabni Dhar Dutta on 16th July, 1964.

3. According to the written statement of the union, the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, Asansol, Nabni Dhar was an active union worker and took part in putting up posters and distribution of handbills and therefore he was disliked by the management; and he was suddenly chargesheeted on 15th June, 1964 on the allegation of theft, and although he denied the charge he was dismissed. According to the union, it was a *malafide* proceeding and the dismissal was a clear case of victimisation.

4. According to the case of the management, however, the management was not aware of the union activities of Nabni Dhar Dutta at all; and Nabni Dhar was dismissed after holding an enquiry according to the principles of natural justice and with the approval of the Chief Mining Engineer.

5. At the hearing of the case, no representative of the union or the workman has appeared, although a representative of the union was present when the date of hearing was fixed on 21st January, 1967 and again on 4th April, 1967 when the Organising Secretary of the Union obtained adjournment to 29th May, 1967. Accordingly, the case has been heard *ex-parte*. The management has examined the enquiring officer, Shri M. L. Kapur and has proved the chargesheet, the reply of the workman, the notice of enquiry, the enquiry proceedings, the report of the enquiring officer, the memo of approval by the C.M.E. and the dismissal order by the Manager dated 16th July, 1964. On scrutiny of the enquiry proceedings, it appears that the Portable Pump was worked by Girish Majhi at No. 15A dip until about 2 p.m. on 9th June, 1964 and then he took the pump and fitted it at 14B split gallery by about 4 p.m. and left it there and came out of the mine; that on the same day in the second shift from 4 p.m. the pump was worked by Haradhan, a badli worker in 14B split gallery, and according to orders Haradhan left the pump where it was and went to work as a machine mazdoor. It appears from the evidence of Shri G. K. Singh, Deputy Manager that the pump was not worked that day in the 3rd shift; and on 10th June, 1964 in the first shift the pump was looked for but it could not be found in 14B split gallery or dip where it had been left. A thorough search was made underground in water and elsewhere but the pump could not be found; a report was made to the manager, Shri M. R. Kamra on 12th June, 1964 and it transpired as a result of enquiry that one Ram Deo Gope had after the second shift of 9th June, 1964 at about 1.20 a.m. (of 10th June, 1964) seen Nabni Dhar Dutta walking up the wooden platform of the screen plant and taking an article from the moving belt and throwing it down on the ground; and that Ram Deo Gope saw that it was a portable pump and he asked Nabni Dhar what he was doing with the pump and Nabni replied that it was out of order and he was taking it to get it repaired. But the pump was never brought to the workshop for repair. Another witness Mohini Mohan stated, that on 9th June, 1964 he was on duty in the 3rd shift and about 12-30 a.m. he saw Nabni Dhar carrying a drill pump and had some talk with him. These were the two main witnesses against Nabni Dhar. They were corroborated by other witnesses to whom they made the report. e.g. Kashai Muchi who said that at about 3 a.m. on 10th June, 1964 Ram Deo called him and said that Nabni Dhar had taken a portable drill pump from the screen plant belt, and to a question put by Kashi Muchi Ram Deo stated that he had fully recognised Nabni Dhar. Ram Deo the main witness was cross examined by the workman who suggested that Ram Deo had a quarrel with Nabni Dhar, but Ram Deo denied the quarrel. The enquiring officer accepted the evidence of Ram Deo and Mohini Mohan and Kashi Muchi and held that the charge was proved. It appears from the enquiry proceedings that the enquiring officer asked Nabni Dhar to adduce evidence in support of his allegation of victimisation but Nabni Dhar replied that he had no defence witness to produce.

6. In the circumstances, it cannot be said that the report of the enquiring officer finding the charge proved was not supported by evidence. It also appears that the enquiry was held properly in accordance with the principles of natural justice. Ext. C shows that the approval of the C.M.E. was obtained before the order of dismissal was passed by the Manager, M. R. Kamra. As stated before, the case has been heard *ex-parte* and naturally therefore no evidence at all has come about any union activity on the part of the workman concerned. The evidence of the enquiring officer, M. L. Kapur is that he was not aware of any union activity on the part of Nabni Dhar and that he did not even know whether he was a member of any union at Girmint Colliery. It is clear therefore that no relief can be granted to the workman concerned.

7. My award is that the dismissal of Shri Nabni Dhar Dutta, mechanical fitter, with effect from 16th July, 1964 by the management of the Girimint Colliery did not amount of victimisation of the workman for his trade union activities and that the workman is not entitled to any relief.

S. K. Sen,
Presiding Officer.

The 29th May, 1967

[No 6 83/64-LRII.]

S.O. 2045.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st May, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA
REFERENCE NO. 15 OF 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited,

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT:

Shri S K Sen—*Presiding Officer.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers.—Shri D Narsingh, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen.—Absent.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines

AWARD

By Order No 6 87 64-LRII dated 5th April 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Girimint Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, P.O. Dishergarh, Distt. Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the subject matter mentioned in the following schedule:

Whether the action of the management of the Girimint Colliery in suspending from service the following 11 Conveyor Loaders for ten days with effect from the 14th August, 1964, was with a view to victimising them for their trade union activities? If so, to what relief are they entitled?

Name of Conveyor loaders

- 1 Shri Hardish Chamar
- 2 Shri Ritu Chamar
- 3 Shri Parsan Chamar
- 4 Shri Hansi Chamar
- 5 Shri Ramjash Dhanuk
- 6 Shri Chedi Singh
- 7 Shri Rambachan
- 8 Shri Thag Dusadh
- 9 Shri Sukhari Chamar
- 10 Shri Sewpujan Tewari
- 11 Shri Surjman Chamar

2. Of the 11 workmen concerned, No. 11 of the reference order, Surjman Chamar was the Sirdar of the Conveyor loaders and the remaining 10 workmen were conveyor loaders working under Surjman Chamar as sirdar. They were all employed at Girimint Colliery and on 13th August 1964 they were working on the first shift from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. at No. 3 pit in the West Dip Section.

3. According to the management, on 13th August 1964 at about 10-30 a.m. these workmen left their working place in a body and came out of the pit on the plea that the tub supply was irregular and that there was some mechanical defect

in the conveyor belt. The mechanical defect in the conveyor belt was repaired within half an hour but the Mining Sirdar could not find the workmen for sometime, after the repair; and about noon at the intervention of the Welfare Officer the loaders went down to their working place again and worked until the end of their shift i.e. until 4 p.m. Next day, 14th August 1964, the 11 workmen were chargesheeted for leaving their place of work in No. 3 pit West Dip Section without obtaining permission from the Mining Sirdar and in violation of the mine rules. They were also placed under suspension. Thereafter an enquiry was held in the presence of all the chargesheeted workmen and 3 defence witnesses named by the workmen were also examined. The charge was however found proved and so the manager on 24th August 1964 passed an order of suspension for 10 days from 14th August 1964 i.e. the suspension from 14th August 1964 was treated as the punishment and the workmen were allowed to join their posts with effect from 24th August 1964 (second shift).

5. According to the written statement of the union, the workmen were active members of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha and thereby they incurred displeasure of the management, and the enquiry held was a farce and was in violation of principles of natural justice; and the order of suspension for 10 days was unfair and unjustified and amounted to victimisation for trade union activities.

5. At the hearing of the case on 29th May 1967 no representative of the union or the workmen appeared, although the date of hearing was fixed in the presence of a representative of the union and thereafter the Organising Secretary of the union personally obtained an adjournment of the hearing to 29th May 1967.

6. Accordingly, the case has been heard *ex-parte*. The management has examined one witness, Shri S. C. Mallik, who was the Welfare Officer at Girimint colliery at the relevant time and he has proved the chargesheets, the reply submitted by the workmen jointly, the notice of enquiry, enquiry proceedings, the enquiry report and the final order of the manager dated 24th August 1964. As no witness has been examined on behalf of the union or the workmen, there is nothing to show that the workmen were members of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha or that they at all took a prominent part in connection with the activities of the union. Shri Mallik has stated in his deposition that he was not aware of any trade union activity on the part of these 11 workmen and that he arrived at his conclusion on the basis of the evidence before him at the enquiry. It has to be held therefore that the punishment imposed in the case of 10 days' suspension was not a case of victimisation of the workmen on account of their trade union activities.

7. In their reply, Ext. B, which is a joint reply by the 11 workmen, there is no allegation made that the chargesheets had been served on them because of their union activities. Therein the workmen gave their version of the case, namely that the trammers deputed to work in their shift were inefficient, as a result of which the conveyor loaders themselves had to push the tubs although it was not a part of their duty, and that there was complaint about the conveyor belt also; and although the attention of Chota Sahib in-charge and the Mining Sirdar had been drawn to the grievances no action had been taken; that on 13th August 1964 the conveyor belt went out of order and coal fell on the ground and the workmen had to signal for stoppage of the conveyor belt and that signal was attended to after sometime; thereafter the matter was reported to the Mining Sirdar and he said that the chain of the conveyor belt had to be repaired but he could not do anything as there was no man there to repair the same; and that the workmen might go and report to the office if they liked, accordingly the workmen went to the office and found the Welfare Officer and submitted their complaint to him and the Welfare Officer took down their complaint and then advised them to go down the mine again, and then they went back to their work place and found that in the meantime the conveyor belt had been repaired. At the enquiry, Biswanath Dhar, Mining Sirdar, was the only witness examined for the management; the management also called as defence witnesses Sri S. N. Padhi, under Manager, Sri A. K. Banerjee, Welfare Officer, and Surman Chamar, the Loader Sirdar who was one of the chargesheeted workman. The under Manager and the Welfare Officer were examined as they had been mentioned in the reply submitted by the chargesheeted workmen. The under Manager stated that in the first week of August, the loaders of West Dip Section had come and complained against the two trammers attached to them, saying that the trammers were not capable of doing work due to old age and debility and requested the under Manager to get the trammers transferred; but this change could not be made as the old trammers could not be put to work at any other site where work was easier. The under Manager did not say anything about the alleged complaint about the condition

of the conveyor belt. Shri A.K. Banerjee, Welfare Officer stated that on 13th August 1964 at about 11-45 a.m. Surjman and 10 of his loaders came to his office and complained about the conveyor belt break-down in their section; and the Welfare Officer at once told them that they should not have come up the mine but should have told the Mining Sirdar about the break down so that he could take necessary steps; the workmen replied that they had already informed the Mining Sirdar, Biswanath Dhar who had told them that he would arrange to get a fitter and had gone towards the pit bottom for the purpose; and that the workmen waited upto 11-15 a.m. and then left the section and came up the pit for reporting to the manager; the Welfare Officer told Surjman Chamar that it was wrong to come up the pit in a body before the end of the shift without the permission of the Mining Sirdar and he asked them to go down again and do their work, but in the meantime he noted down the complaint and stated that he would send the same to the manager. The complaint which was written down and which was signed by Surjman Chamar and some of the loaders was admitted as an exhibit at the enquiry. Surjman Chamar, Loader Sirdar said that when the loaders brought the break down to the notice of the Mining Sirdar, Biswanath Dhar, the Mining Sirdar said that he had no fitter with him and could not do anything and told the loaders that they could go anywhere and inform anybody they liked; but after that the Mining Sirdar went away probably to get men for rectifying the conveyor belt, and that the loaders said that since the Mining Sirdar had spoken in that way, they would come up the pit and report to the manager; the Sirdar asked them not to come up until the Mining Sirdar returned, but the loaders did not listen and they went to the surface and the sirdar also followed them. The complaint was made to the Welfare Officer, A. K. Banerjee who asked them to go down and they went down again and worked until the end of the shift; the conveyor belt had been repaired in the meantime; 13 loaders loaded 29 tubs by 4 p.m. It appears from the evidence of enquiring officer, Sri S. C. Mallick, that that was nearly the full out-turn of 13 loaders at one shift. Accordingly, it appears that though the loaders had come up the mine without obtaining the previous permission of the Mining Sirdar as required by rules before the end of their shift, they did so only because the conveyor belt broke down and they had grievance against the work of the trammers, and that they went down again when the Welfare Officer told them that they were wrong to come up and must go down, and that after going back they did practically the full out-turn of their shift. The Mining Sirdar, Biswanath Dhar denied when cross examined that he had asked the workmen to come up and see anybody or to see the manager. He claimed that he had said that one fitter was looking after 2 sections namely, the 4 rise and 4 west dip and that he would get the fitter from the other section as soon as possible and get the defect rectified, and that he also told them that this would be done within half an hour or so and he said that when he came back with the fitter he did not find the workmen there and the workmen came back only some-time after the repair had been done.

8. The workmen therefore, were technically guilty of the offence charged, but there were certain extenuating circumstances, and it appears to me that the sentence of suspension for 10 days was too severe in their circumstances. But in view of the terms of reference order and in view of my finding that the suspension did not amount to victimisation for trade union activities it is not possible to give any relief to the workmen.

9. My award, therefore, is that the action of the management of Girimint colliery in suspending the 11 conveyor loaders for 10 days from 14th August 1964 did not amount to victimisation for their trade union activities and therefore even though the punishment was too severe the workmen cannot be granted any relief.

S. K. SEN,

Presiding Officer

[No. 6/87/64-LRI.]

The 29th May, 1967.

S.O. 2046.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Rudrampur Division and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th May, 1967.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (C), ANDHRA PRADESH, HYDERABAD

PRESENT:

Sri Mohammad Najmuddin, M.A., B.L.—Chairman, Industrial Tribunal,
Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 47 of 1966

BETWEEN:

Workmen of Rudrampur Division of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Kothagudum.

AND

The Employers of Rudrampur Division of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Kothagudum.

AWARD

The Government of India in its Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment) had, by Order No 7/31,66-LRII dated 24th September 1966, referred this case to me for adjudication. The issue as per Schedule annexed to the Notification is this:—

Having regard to the nature of the duties performed by Shri Vajrapu Chandra Rao in Belt Section at No 5 Incline, Rudrampur Division of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, whether the demand of the workman for a higher category is justified?

If so, from what date?

2. The Singareni Collieries Workers Union is party to the reference. The statement of claims was filed by and under the signature of Mr. M. Kumariah, General Secretary of the Union. The workman is in Category IV. His claim is to Category VII. The Management filed counter.

3. The dispute stands posted to this day for enquiry. Mr. P. S. Jayachandra Rao the Divisional Personnel Officer of Rudrampur Division brought today a Memorandum of Settlement dated 19th May 1967 relating to this dispute. It is signed by Mr. Kumariah, representing the workmen, Mr. Vasudevan and Mr. D. V. Paranjpe signed it representing the Management. They are respectively Deputy General Manager and Agent, Rudrampur Division. It is attested by two witnesses, Mr. P. S. Jayachandrarao and Mr. Pulla Reddy. As I said, the claim of the workman is to category VII having regard to the nature of the duties performed by him. He is now in Category IV. The terms of settlement provide that the claimant, Vajrapu Chandra Rao, would be given a trade test within 10 days from the date of the settlement and that if he qualifies therein he would be placed in Category VII with effect from 1st December 1966. I am satisfied that the settlement is fair between the parties.

4. Award is herewith passed in terms of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 19th May 1967, a copy whereof is appended hereto.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Tribunal, this the 26th day of May, 1967

(Sd.) Illegible.

Industrial Tribunal.

APPENDIX

Memorandum of Settlement arrived at I.D. No. 47 of 66 between the management S.C. Co. Ltd., and their Workmen Represented by the S.C.W.U. under the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 on 19th May 1967 in the Office of the Dy. General Manager, Kothagudum Collieries.

Names of the parties:

Representing the Management
(S.C. Co., Ltd.)

- 1 Sri M. Vasudevan,
Dy. G.M.
- 2 Sri D. V. Paranjpe,
Ag't., RD.

Representing the Workmen
(S.C.W. Union)

1. Sri M. Komarolah
Genl. Secy

Short recital of the case

The Genl Secretary of the SCW Union Kothagudlum through his letter No GS/5inc/3351/61, dated 10th May 1966 representd that Sri Vajrapu Chandra Rao working as a fitter in belt section in No 5 Inc should be paid cat VII as fitter, as his juniors were promoted to Cat VII prior to him

Conciliation discussions were held on 16th June 1966 at the office of the Asst Labour Commissioner (C) Hyderabad which ended in failure. The matter was referred to adjudication by the Government of India vide order No F. No 7/31/66-LRII dated 24th September 1966 to the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad. It was registered as ID No 47 of 66. With a view to arrive at an amicable settlement, discussions were held between the Union and the Management on 19th May 1967

After prolonged discussions, a settlement was arrived at on the following terms and conditions

Terms and Conditions

1 Sri Vajrapu Chandra Rao, fitter in Belt section at No 5 Incline will be trade-tested within 10 days from the date of this settlement

2 If Sri Vajrapu Chandra Rao qualifies in the trade-test he will be allowed cat VII with a basic of Rs 1 87 with effect from 1st December 1966

3 All the claims put forward by the Union in the dispute on the issues raised by them for adjudication stand fully settled

4 Both the parties agreed to approach the Hon'ble Tribunal, Hyderabad to record the settlement as a compromise

*Signatures of the Parties**Representing the Management*

- 1 (Sd) M VASUDEVAN
- 2 (Sd) D V PARANPE.

Witnesses —

- 1 (Sd) P S JAYACHANDRA RAO.
- 2 (Sd) PULLA REDDY

Kothagudlum Collieries,
The 19th May, 1967.

Representing the Workmen

- 1 (Sd) M KOMARAIAN.

(Sd) Illegible,
Industrial Tribunal

[No 7/31/66-LRII]

New Delhi, the 7th June 1967

S.O. 2047.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court (Central), Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Sasti Colliery, Nagpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd June, 1967.

AWARD

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR**

CAMP AT ALLAHABAD

Dated May 24 1967

PRESENT

Shri G C Agarwala—*Presiding Officer*

REFERENCE No CGIT/LC (1)/67

In the matter of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Sasti Colliery, Nagpur and their workmen

APPEARANCES

For the employers—Shri S V Kanade Personnel Officer of M/s Ballarpur Collieries Co., Nagpur

For the workmen—Dr D P Kawadkar, President, Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union, Ballarpur, Dist—Chanda

INDUSTRY Coal Mine

DISTRICT Nagpur (Maharashtra)

AWARD

By Notification No. 3/1/66-LRII, dated 3rd January, 1967, the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation, Government of India, referred the following matter of dispute as stated in the Schedule to the order of reference for adjudication to this Tribunal:—

SCHEDULE

Whether Dr. W. K. Maste, Medical Officer, Sasti Colliery had been correctly dismissed and if not to what relief is he entitled?

2. After usual notices, the parties filed their written statements followed by rejoinders. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties certain additional issues were framed on 20th March, 1967. These additional issues may be reproduced as disclosing the points in controversy between the parties:—

Additional Issues

1. (a) Was Dr. Maste member of Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union before his dismissal?

(b) Was the aforesaid Union competent to espouse the dispute?

(c) Are the employers estopped from raising the question?

2. (a) Whether the Enquiry Officer, Shri R. K. Singh was incompetent to hold domestic enquiry?

(b) Was he suffering from bias?

3. Whether the enquiry is vitiated for reasons given in paragraph 17 of the written statement of the Union?

4. Was the order of dismissal recorded by competent authority and in accordance with the Standing Orders?

5. Was the workman concerned, Dr. Maste, guilty of misconduct in respect of charges under charge-sheet dated 1st July, 1965 and 3rd July, 1965?

The parties were directed to produce evidence on the first four issues which they did on 11th April 1967. Before the commencement of the hearing on this date, an application No. 27/A was filed by the management raising a technical plea and praying for amendment. It raised the question that the dispute relates to Maharashtra State, hence this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court has no jurisdiction. Since it was obviously based on some misunderstanding, the plea was rejected as no territorial jurisdiction has been fixed by the notification in the establishment of this Tribunal. The management probably thought erroneously that the jurisdiction of this Tribunal is restricted to area covered by Madhya Pradesh, hence this vain plea. After evidence was recorded on issues No. 1 to 4, arguments were heard and it was considered expedient that the parties should be allowed to produce evidence on the remaining issue No. 5 which they did on 10th May, 1967. Arguments were thereafter reheard on the entire case and the employers filed written arguments also next day.

Dr. W. K. Maste, the concerned workman, had been in the service of Ballarpur Colliery Co., Nagpur for a period of about 30 years. The Ballarpur Colliery is a public undertaking, hereinafter call the company, having their Head Office at Nagpur and three collieries namely, Ballarpur, Ghughus and Sasti. Dr. Maste had been at Sasti Colliery for about seven years. The present management of the colliery was taken over sometime in 1954. It is needless to narrate the facts in details leading to the dismissal order in question. Suffice shall it be to state that the Head Office at Nagpur had suspicion that the indent for medical stores was over stated by the Doctor as compared to other collieries and therefore the Manager carried out a surprise physical check of certain items of medicines, 31 in number, selected at random on 19th June 1965 and 23rd June 1965. As a result of this surprise check, it was found that stock of medicines as mentioned in the indent dated 7th April 1965 was noted less than found entered in the Stock Register and further the physical stock was found more than mentioned either in the stock register or in the indent. He also found that the entries in the Stock Register were made only upto April, 1965. The charge-sheet dated 1st July, 1965 (Ex. E/1) was, therefore, issued against Dr. Maste. On the following date, the Manager received certain complaints, two of which were in writing, that the Doctor had been in the habit of accepting illegal gratification from those who were sent for medical examination on recruitment for fitness certificate and that he had also been misappropriating certain medicines. A supplementary charge-sheet dated 3rd July, 1965 was issued to Dr. Maste on both

the charge-sheets dated 1st July and 3rd July contending that he had been implicated at the instance of Shri Krishnarao a Labour leader. The management appointed one Shri R. K. Singh, Assistant Labour Officer then posted at Ballarpur Colliery, as Enquiry Officer. He conducted the domestic enquiry on 7th August, 1965 and as a result of the enquiry and his finding the Manager after seeking approval from the Personnel Officer of the Company dismissed Dr. Maste by means of letter dated 26/27th October, 1965 (Ex. W/9). The Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union, P.O. Ballarpur took up the matter for Dr. Maste which in due course has resulted in this reference.

Findings

Issue No. 1.—The employers in para 19 of the written statement raised a specific plea that Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union had no *locus standi* to espouse the cause of Dr. Maste as it was not a recognised Union. It was further alleged that Dr. Maste was not a member of this Union prior to the accrual of the cause of action. In reply to the written statement of the management, the Union filed a rejoinder and in para 11 of the rejoinder it was stated that this Union had been representing Dr. Maste during the correspondence with the partner of the management and before the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central). No objection had been raised during conciliation proceedings that the Union was not competent to sponsor the dispute and therefore the management is estopped from raising the question. It was on the basis of these pleas that the issue in three parts has been framed. Taking up the last part of the issue, in industrial adjudication, the rule of estoppel has no application. Proceedings in conciliation are neither judicial nor quasijudicial [vide A.I.R. 1956 (Cal) p. 550; Royal Calcutta Golf Club Mazdoor Union Vs. the State]. Consequently, just because the management failed to take up this question in conciliation proceedings will not operate as estoppel against them.

For the second part of the issue regarding the competency of the Union, the plea of the management that the Union is not affiliated to INTUC but some other Union is so affiliated is also of no avail. Whether it is affiliated or not to any Federation is of no consequence. Similarly the question of recognition is wholly extraneous to question of competency to sponsor the dispute. It has been admitted by Shri Arvind Mahadeo Bage (E.W. 1) Labour Welfare Officer of this Colliery that only this Union, Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union, is actively working in this Colliery. That being so, the Union was competent to sponsor the dispute irrespective of the number of workers as members of the Union and the fact whether it has been recognised or not. This point is held in favour of the Union.

The first part, however, is vital and damaging for the Union. It is now a settled law that before a Tribunal can assume jurisdiction under Section—10, I.D. Act, the dispute must be an industrial dispute. An individual worker's case can become an industrial dispute provided he had been a member of the Union before his dismissal and the Union has a sufficiently representative capacity to espouse the dispute. Even though Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union may have such representative capacity, it is not proved in this case that Dr. Maste actually was member of this Union at the relevant time, namely, 26th October, 1965. The point had been specifically raised by the management and it was for the Union to have established it by cogent proof. The only evidence tendered in this connection was a Membership Register (Ex. W/22) and oral evidence of two witnesses, one of whom was Dr. Maste himself as W.W. 1 and the other was Sri Purshottam Bhanudas Gade W.W. 2. The latter stated that a separate register is maintained for every colliery and the register is maintained alphabetically. At page 16 of the Register, there is an entry for the year 1965-66 and Dr. Maste is recorded in the last serial. By this entry, it is attempted to be proved that by means of a receipt No. 902 a lump sum subscription was paid for the months from April, 1965 upto January, 1966. Curiously, however, neither the receipt has been filed by Dr. Maste nor counterfoil produced by Shri Gade. No account book was produced to show that any payment was actually received and credited in the accounts. The entry in the register is extremely doubtful by the fact that the receipt No. 902 through which payment is purported to have been received is again mentioned at page 10 against the name of one Gaddi Ashaloo (Sl No 2) whereby Rs. 10/- are shown to have been realised from him. Obviously, there could not be two receipts bearing the same number 902 and one of them must naturally be fictitious or faked. When the point had been specifically challenged by the management, it was incumbent both on Dr. Maste and the Union to have produced and filed the original receipt and the counterfoil. Shri Purshottam Bhanudas Gade (W.W. 2) except for filing the register did not state affirmatively that receipt purported to have been issued to Dr. Maste bore his signature. His evidence, therefore, carries no conviction. Both he and Dr. Maste stated that Dr. Maste had been a member of this Union

from 1963. Curiously however, no proof has been tendered to show that previous to the year in question Dr. Maste was in fact a member and from which it would be inferred that he would have continued in the ordinary course to be a member in the year in question. Dr. Maste stated that the receipts for payment of subscription were lost when his belongings were removed from the quarter of the Company. This statement does not inspire confidence particularly when he was able to file a receipt of Colliery Mazdoor Sewa Mandal (Ex. W/2) dated 4th November 1958. He would not possibly have preserved such an old receipt and lost the latter receipts to show his membership in 1965-66. The Labour Welfare Officer of the company Shri Arvind Mahadeo Baga (E.W. 1) gave a categorical statement that when Dr. Maste came to collect his luggage after the termination of his service, he wanted the help of the witness for labourers to remove the luggage and during his talk with him, Dr. Maste admitted that he was not a member of any Union. The witness, therefore, proved the admission of Dr. Maste which was not controverted by Dr. Maste when he re-examined himself on issue No. 5. The admission, therefore, remained unassailed.

This Union, Maharashtra Colliery Workers' Union, seems to have taken up interest in Dr. Maste after the dismissal order and presumably on the handsome recompense promised and actually fulfilled by Dr. Maste for sponsoring the dispute. This is clear by the register itself. For the year 1966-67 at page 45 of the register, Dr. Maste is recorded to have paid Rs. 2/- as subscription for February and March and later on Rs. 40/- by one receipt, Rs. 200/- by another receipt, Rs. 46/- under a third and Rs. 90/- under a fourth receipt. Dr. Maste's application addressed to the President and purported to be dated 20th March 1966 contains a promise to pay 10 per cent of the total claim which he might receive as a result of this case to the Union. This smacks of champertous agreement. With such an alluring promise, anything could have been contrived to show that Dr. Maste was really a member on and before the relevant date. The mere production of register and oral evidence of one witness who himself had not made the entries would not be convincing proof of the fact that Dr. Maste was really a member of the Union. A close scrutiny of the register would show that the entries are not reliable. From the Register receipt No. 902 is shown to have been issued to Dr. Maste in January, 1966. The previous number 901 is stated to have been issued in November, 1965 to one V. S. Nursa and mentioned at page 27 of the register. If the entries are genuine, it follows that from November 1965 to January, 1966 there had been no collection which is extremely improbable. As stated by E.W. 1, Arvind Mahadeo Baga, Labour Welfare Officer, the Union representative collects subscription on pay day every month and this should be natural in the ordinary course of events. Further if the receipt No. 902 to Dr. Maste was really genuine and issued in the month of January, 1966 other receipts of subsequent series should be after January. It is, however, found that receipt No. 925 at page 6 bears the date of November, 1965 and Receipt No. 921 at page 18 is shown as issued in November/December, 1965. Obviously, therefore, there had been some antedating or at any rate no systematic maintenance of record. It is, therefore, not proved at all that Dr. Maste was really member of this Union on or before the date of termination of his service. That being so, the Union is not competent to sponsor and espouse the dispute *vis-a-vis* Dr. Maste and the dispute remains an individual dispute and not an industrial dispute. This Tribunal, therefore, has no jurisdiction.

With the above finding that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate, it is neither possible nor expedient to record any finding on other points covered by issues No. 2 and 5. No order is made for costs. Let a copy of this order be sent to parties also.

The 24th May, 1967

G. C. AGARWALA,
Presiding Officer.

[No.3/1/66-LRII]

S.O. 2048.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the New Ardhogram Colliery, P.O. Ardhogram District Bankura and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st May, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA.

REFERENCE No. 64 OF 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the New Ardhogram Colliery,
AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Sen—*Presiding Officer*.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers—Shri Bimala Sankar Misra.

On behalf of Workmen—Shri Sreedhar Das Banerjee (Concerned workmen).

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines

AWARD

By Order No. 6/107/65-LR.II dated 13th October, 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the New Ardhogram Colliery, P.O. Ardhogram, Dist. Bankura, and their workmen arising out of the termination of services of Shri Sreedhar Das Banerjee, Surveyor, with effect from 5th February, 1965.

2. According to union, Sri Sreedhar Das Banerjee worked as a surveyor at New Ardhogram Colliery from 14th May, 1962; and on 1st August, 1964 the management asked him to work also as surveyor in respect of Khiraitore Khas Colliery under the same management promising some increments in his pay for extra work; but no increment was given and Shri Banerjee informed the management by a letter dated 26th December, 1964 that unless the promised increment was given he would not work at Khiraitore Khas Colliery. Sometime thereafter the management suddenly terminated his services with effect from 5th February, 1965 without drawing up any chargesheet or holding any enquiry. According to the union, Sri Banerjee was an active member of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. The union challenged the termination of service as *malafide* and as amounting to unfair labour practice.

3. According to the management Shri Sreedhar Das Banerjee was showing habitual neglect in respect of his duties as surveyor and was irregular in attendance and therefore the management lost confidence in him and terminated his services with effect from 5th February, 1965; and Shri Banerjee made over charge of the instruments and reports which were lying with him on 11th February, 1965 to the management and informed the management by a letter that he was not sorry that his services had been terminated. According to the management, therefore, Shri Banerjee accepted the termination of service and therefore he could not thereafter raise a dispute alleging that the termination of service was improperly done.

4. Before the Conciliation Officer it appears that the management agreed to take back Shri Banerjee in his post and offered to pay half pay for the period of unemployment. There was however some hitch and therefore the agreement did not become final and ultimately a failure report was submitted by the Conciliation Officer and the dispute was referred to the tribunal.

5. The parties filed their written statements, before the tribunal. On the date fixed for hearing, 27th May 1967, the parties however appeared and stated that the case had been settled and they filed a joint petition of compromise. It appears that the settlement was made between the parties in January 1967 and Shri Banerjee was allowed to rejoin his post with effect from 1st February, 1967 and for the period of unemployment from 5th February, 1965 to 31st January, 1967, the management has agreed to pay 50 per cent of the wages in 12 monthly instalments. The terms must be considered satisfactory and the petition of compromise is, therefore, accepted, and I make an award in terms of the petition of compromise which shall form part of the award.

(Sd) S. K. SEN,
Presiding Officer.

The 27th May, 1967.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 64 OF 1966

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute

BETWEEN

The Employees in relation to New Ardhamgram Colliery

AND

Their Workmen, represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, Raniganj.

The parties jointly submit that the disputes in the above referred reference have been mutually settled on the following terms and conditions:

- (1) That Sri Sredhar Das Banerjee has already been employed by the Management on and from the 1st February 1967 as per mutual discussion.
- (2) That the period of employment from 5th February 1965 to the date of his re-instatement will be treated as leave with 50 per cent wages and the total amount will be paid to this workman in 12 monthly instalments from February, 1967.
- (3) That this resolves this disputes.

The parties therefore hereby submit to your honour that Award may kindly be given on the basis of the above settlement and for this act of kindness the parties shall remain obliged.

Representing Employer
(Bimla Sankar Misra)
27-5-1967.

Representing Workmen
(Robin Chatterjee),

Authorised representative of
the employer
New Ardhamgram Colliery
P.O. Ardhamgram
Distt. Bankura.

Vice-President
Colliery Mazdoor Sabha
Raniganj.
Sreedhar Das Banerjee,
2-5-1967.

[No. 6/107/65-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 9th June 1967

S.O. 2049.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Chinakuri 1 and 2 Pits Colliery of M/s Bengal Coal Company Ltd., P.O. Dishergarh, Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th June, 1967.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 30 OF 1966

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Chinakuri 1 & 2 Pits Colliery of M/s. Bengal Coal Company Ltd.,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Sen—*Presiding Officer*.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers—Shri D. Narsingh. Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Shri N. R. Roy, Advocate & Shri Provat Goswami,
Org. Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Union.

STATE: West Bengal

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines

AWARD

By Order No 6/102/64-JR II dated 14th May 1965, the Central Government referred for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Chinakuri 1 and 2 Pits Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited P.O. Dishergarh, Burdwan, and their workmen arising out of the dismissal of Shri Chandrasekhar Prasad, Conveyor Khalasi with effect from 8th October 1964.

2. According to the written statement of the union, Chandrasekhar Prasad, who had been working at Chinakuri 1 and 2 Pits Colliery as a Conveyor Khalasi for more than four years, became an active member of the Colliery Mazdoor Union when it was established at the colliery; but the management did not recognise this

union and Chandrasekhar Prasad incurred the displeasure of the management for his active part in organising the branch of the union at the colliery. A chargesheet dated 12th June 1964 was issued on Chandrasekhar Prasad alleging that he had booked extra tubs to miners and loaders on different dates beginning from the week ending 4th January 1964 to the week ending 9th March 1964; the workman denied the truth of the allegation and submitted an explanation of the circumstances in which he had supplied extra tubs; but the management did not accept the explanation as satisfactory and held an enquiry, at which the workman was not given a reasonable opportunity to defend himself, and thereafter the manager passed an order dismissing Chandrasekhar Prasad from service with effect from 6th October 1964. According to the union, the dismissal was unjustified and amounted to victimisation of the workman for his trade union activities.

3. The management in their written statement asserted that the workman was dismissed for grave mis-conduct duly established at a fair and impartial enquiry and that the management was not even aware that the workman had become a member of the newly established union or in fact that he had participated in any trade union activity at all. As regards the long period of suspension between the date of service of chargesheet and the date of order of dismissal, the management stated that the workman was paid full wages for the period of suspension exceeding 10 days. As regards the enquiry, the management stated that the workman was present on every day on which the enquiry was held and that he was given full opportunity to cross examine the management's witnesses and to produce his own witnesses in defence. The management denied that there was any victimisation of the workman for trade union activities.

4. On the date of hearing, 2nd June 1967, the parties appeared and stated that the matter had been settled amicably and filed a joint petition of compromise. By the terms of the settlement the workman Chandrasekhar Prasad has accepted an offer of an *ex-gratia* payment of Rs. 340.86 in full and final settlement of his claims against the management and given up the claim for reinstatement. The payment is to be made within 15 days from the date of filing of the agreement before the tribunal, i.e. within 15 days from 2nd June 1967. In view of the fact that the tribunal cannot interfere with the punishment where the domestic enquiry is found to be properly held, the terms must be considered satisfactory and are therefore accepted.

5. An award is made in terms of the petition of compromise which shall form part of the award.

The 2nd June 1967.

(Sd.) S. K. SEN,
Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 CALCUTTA
REFERENCE No. 30 OF 1966

BETWEEN

Employers in relation to Chinakuri 1 & 2 Pits Colliery of M/s. Bengal Coal Co. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Union, Asansol.

Joint Petition of Compromise

The parties aforesaid most respectfully beg to submit as under:—

1. The issue referred to this Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication reads as follows:—

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the management of Chinakuri 1 & 2 Pits Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Co., Ltd. was justified in dismissing from service Shri Chandrasekhar Prasad, Conveyor Khalasi, with effect from 6th October, 1964 or was it an act of victimisation?

(2) To what relief is the workman entitled?

2. This Hon'ble Tribunal has called upon the parties to submit their written statements which they have done

3. Both the parties to this reference, however, have reached an amicable settlement by mutual negotiations on the following terms:—

(a) The management shall make to Sri Chandrasekhar Prasad, the workman herein concerned, an *ex-gratia* payment of Rs. 340.86 (Rupees three hundred forty and Paise eighty six only) in full and final settlement of all his claims against the management.

(b) The workman concerned and the union on his behalf have agreed to accept the aforesaid *ex-gratia* payment in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman against the management. The said payment shall be made within 15 days from the date on which this agreement shall be filed before this Hon'ble Tribunal.

(c) The workman or his union acting on his behalf has no other claims against the management arising out of this present reference.

4. It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be graciously pleased to give its award in the aforesaid terms thereof.

And for this, the parties shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Sd/- Illegible

Organising Secretary,
Colliery Mazdoor Union,
Asansol.

Sd/- Illegible

For the Employers.

Sd/- Illegible

For the Workmen.

[No. 6/102/64-LRII.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 6th June 1967

S.O. 2050—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Burrakur Coal Company Limited—Managing Agents, Messrs Bird and Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Sijua (District Dhanbad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the additional Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Messrs Bird and Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Sijua (District Dhanbad) was justified in transferring Shri A. K. Chatterji, Clerk, Grade-III from the office of the Chief Mining Engineer, Messrs Bird and Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Sijua (District Dhanbad) to Saitor Colliery, with effect from the 12th September, 1966 and in subsequently dismissing him from service with effect from the 8th February, 1967? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 2/78/67-LRII]

New Delhi, the 9th June 1967

S.O. 2051—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Kalipahari Colliery, Post Office Kalipahari (District Burdwan) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Kalipahari Colliery, Post Office Kalipahari (District Burdwan) in dismissing Shri Jupha Singh, Crew, with effect from the 25th March, 1967 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 6/41/67-LRII.]

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour & Employment)*New Delhi, the 12th June 1967*

S.O. 2052.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 2060 dated the 29th June, 1966, the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factory namely, the Regional Press, Tiruchirapalli, in an implemented area, hereby exempts the said factory from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 1st June, 1967.

[No. F. 6/16/66-HI.]

S.O. 2053.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishments as mentioned in the Schedule annexed hereto have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishments;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishments.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of July, 1966.

SCHEDULE

- 1 Messrs. Mathugapoda Lime Stone Mine (A)
Lessee: M/s Abdur Rahaman Khan
R. F. Dhone Taluk
Kurnool District (Andhra Pradesh).
2. Messrs. Mathugapoda Lime Stone Mine
Lessee: M/s. L. Hassan Khan
R. F. Dhone Taluk
Kurnool District (Andhra Pradesh)
3. Messrs. Mathugapoda Lime Stone Mine (B)
Lessee: M/s L. Noor Mahmood Khan and Company
R. F. Dhone Taluk
Kurnool District (Andhra Pradesh).

[No. 8/3/66 PF-II.]

S.O. 2054.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Sri Maruthi Industries, 7-7/8th Mills, Opposite Malathi Halli Gate, Mysore Road, Bangalore-26, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of April, 1967.

[No. 8/60/67-PF-II.]

S.O. 2055.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Diana Agencies, Dhobi Talao, Bombay 2 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of January, 1965.

[No. 8(77)66-PF-II.]

S.O. 2056 --Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment Messrs Sundutta Fabrics, No. 2320, Vani Buildings, 4th Cross Road, Malleshwaram,

Bangalore-3 (Mysore State), and its Bombay Branch at Victor House, Annexe, Clark Road, Bombay-11, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of January, 1967.

[No. 8(80)/66-PF-II.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour and Employment)

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 7th June 1967

S.O. 2057.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank Limited, New Delhi, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of the Punjab National Bank Limited, New Delhi is justified in not fixing the pay of Shri R. P. Sharma at Rs. 85 per month as per the directions contained in Para 537 of the Sastry Award, on his transfer from Mandsaur Branch to Bhopal Branch of the Bank? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 51/55/66/LRIV.]

New Delhi, the 9th June 1967

S.O. 2058.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen employed in Sitapur Branch in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), and in supersession of the order of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1500 dated the 15th April, 1967, the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri Mithan Lal as the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Lucknow and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India, Sitapur Branch in not absorbing Shri K. B. Mahendra, Money Tester in the bank's permanent service and terminating his services with effect from the 4th March, 1965 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 51(63)/66-LRIV.]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

(Department of Rehabilitation)**(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)***New Delhi, the 6th June 1967*

S.O. 2059.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section (6) of the Administration of the Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (XXXI of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. S. Dhuri, Assistant Settlement Officer in the office of the Assistant Settlement Commissioner Incharge, Bombay as Assistant Custodian for the State of Maharashtra for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with effect from 1st May, 1967.

[No. 7(18)/AGZ/65.]

S.O. 2060.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (a) of sub-section (2) of Section 16 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) the Central Government hereby appoints for the State of Maharashtra, Shri R. S. Dhuri, Assistant Settlement Officer in the office of Assistant Settlement Commissioner Incharge, Bombay, as Managing Officer for the custody, management and disposal of compensation pool with effect from the date he took over charge of his office.

[No. 7(18)/AGZ/65.]

New Delhi, the 8th June 1967

S.O. 2061.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (Act XXXI of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri Sardari Lal, Officer on Special Duty (Recovery), in the office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner, Delhi as Assistant Custodian for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to the Custodian by or under the said Act with effect from the date he took over charge of his office.

[No. 7(1)ARG/62.]

S.O. 2062.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. L. Wason, Competent Officer, Delhi as Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with effect from the forenoon of 6th June, 1967.

[No. 14(4)/AGZ/65.]

A. G. VASWANI.

Settlement Commissioner (A) &
Ex-officio Under Secy.**(Department of Rehabilitation)****(Office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner, Madhya Pradesh & Rajasthan)****ORDER***Jaipur the 9th June 1967*

S.O. 2063.—In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 34 of the (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act., 1954, I hereby delegate my powers of Determining under Section 7(3)/ *ibid* the net compensation payable to the claimants to Shri N. B. Gorwaney, Settlement Officer and also authorise him under Rule 15 of Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 to prepare summaries in Appendix VII and to sign the payment orders thereon w.e.f. 2nd June, 1967.

[No. RSCR/AO/Admn/1(32)/67/Policy/19018.]

GULAB L. AJWANI.

Regional Settlement Commissioner,
Madhya Pradesh & Rajasthan.

